



THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3762
#12
CD
2/11/01

Applicant: G. Zhang et al Attorney Docket: 970663.CON
Serial No.: 09/206,329 Group Art Unit: 3762
Filed: December 8, 1998 Examiner: Evanisko, G.
For: AUTOCAPTURE PACING/SENSING CONFIGURATION

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

JAN 25 2001
TC 3700 MAIL ROOM
RECEIVED

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed on October 27, 2000, please enter the following remarks.

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed October 27, 2000. Claims 1 through 36 are pending. Claims 19, 23 and 30 have been amended above. Support for the amendments can be found generally throughout the specification and figures.

Examiner rejected Claims 1 through 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

Regarding Claim 1 and 19, Examiner contends that "reduced capacitance" is a relative term and is therefore vague. Examiner states that there is no reference to compare the coupling capacitance with so that it can be "reduced." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of Claims 1 and 19. As Examiner knows, the use of terms of degree claim language does not automatically render a claim indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The acceptability of the claim language depends on whether one of ordinary skill in the art would understand what is claimed in light of the specification. (See M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(b)). In view of